



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,600	06/18/2001	Jeff M. Anderson	10011123-1	3353

7590 10/07/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

DENNISON, JERRY B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/884,600

Applicant(s)

ANDERSON ET AL.

Examiner

J. Bret Dennison

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09/01 / 06/01
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in response to Application Number 09/884,600 received on 18 June 2001.
2. Claims 1-24 are presented for examination.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 8-10, 15-17, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Prust (U.S. Patent Number 6,714,968).

3. Regarding claims 1, 8, 15, and 22, Prust discloses a document retrieval method comprising:

receiving a request email message from a requesting device via a network, the request email message embodying a document request (Prust, col. 7, lines 25-30);

automatically generating a response email message with at least one document attached thereto in response to the document request (Prust, col. 7, lines 30-35); and

automatically transmitting the response email message to a destination address on the network (Prust, col. 7, lines 30-35).

4. Regarding claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 16, 17, 23, and 24, Prust discloses the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 1, 8, 15, and 22, including parsing the request email message to identify the destination address and the at least one document requested (Prust, col. 7, lines 25-35, Prust teaches when a file is requested, the user indicates where to locate that file in the email, and the server uses this location information to find the file and send it).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 11, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prust in view of Beerman, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,084,952).

5. Regarding claims 4, 11, and 18, Prust discloses the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 1, 8, and 15, including determining if the requesting device is authorized to retrieve the at least one document (Prust, col. 1, line3 37-43). However, Prust does not explicitly state automatically generating an access denial email message in response to the request email message when the requesting device is not authorized to retrieve the at least one document. In an analogous art of communicating

Art Unit: 2143

electronic messages between a remote device and a server, Beerman teaches an information processing subsystem which sends an email message to the unauthorized remote device user indicating authentication failure (Beerman, col. 9, lines 30-40).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate sending authentication failure emails to users trying to request files in order to notify users of not being authorized of retrieval of documents.

Claims 5, 12, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prust in view of Cho. et al. (International Publication Number WO 01/33874).

6. Regarding claims 5, 12, and 19, Prust discloses the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 1, 8, and 15. However, Prust does not explicitly state receiving a request email message from a requesting device via a network, the request email message embodying a document request; automatically generating a response email message with at least one document attached thereto in response to the document request; and automatically transmitting the response email message to a destination address on the network. In an analogous art of remote file management, Cho discloses a file system directory structure viewing which makes it possible to view a directory listing of files belonging to the selected directory (Cho, page 7, lines 20-25). Cho also discloses the distribution manager transmitting files through email (Cho, page 6, lines 7-8). Prust and Cho are analogous because both inventions include remote file management where a user can access their stored files through email. Therefore it

would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate having access to directory listings to enable the user to choose from a list which file the user desires.

7. Regarding claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20, and 21, Prust and Cho disclose the limitations, substantially as claimed, as described in claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 15, and 19. However, Prust and Cho do not explicitly state determining whether the request email message is properly formatted; and transmitting an error message to the requesting device when the request email message is not properly formatted. In an analogous art of networking, Nielsen discloses an email response process where an email is generated to respond to any format errors found from parsing the email for parameters (Nielsen, col. 5 line 63 through col. 6, line 13). Therefore it would have been obvious to one in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate format error response system into the remote file and directory management system of Prust and Cho to provide the user with feedback in case of an error in the requesting email.

### ***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Bret Dennison whose telephone number is (571)272-3910. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5pm.

Art Unit: 2143

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on (703)308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

J. Bret Dennison  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2143



DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100